

**REMARKS**

At the time of the Final Office Action dated August 5, 2005, claims 1-44 were pending and rejected. Claims 20-22 have been cancelled, and claim 23 has been amended to clarify that the invention recited in claim 23 is directed to a machine performing a method. Also, independent claims 1 and 23 have been amended to clarify that a value of a first polynomial is outputted as a floating point number and the floating point number is a digital representation of an arbitrary real number in a machine processing unit.

Applicants acknowledge, with appreciation, Examiner Steven's courtesy and professionalism in conducting a telephonic interview on October 27, 2005, during which the present Amendment was discussed. It is Applicants' understanding that the present Amendment would overcome the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

**CLAIM 20 IS REJECTED UNDER THE FIRST PARAGRAPH OF 35 U.S.C. § 112**

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that claim 20 contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention. Although Applicants disagree with the Examiner's conclusion, claim 20 has been cancelled; and thus, the rejection of claim 20 under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 is moot.

**CLAIMS 21 AND 22 ARE REJECTED UNDER THE SECOND PARAGRAPH OF 35 U.S.C. §**

**112**

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that claims 21 and 22 are indefinite for failing to particular point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regards as the invention. Although Applicants disagree with the Examiner's conclusion, claims 21 and 22 have been cancelled; and thus, the rejection of claims 21 and 22 under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 is moot.

**CLAIMS 23-44 ARE REJECTED UNDER THE SECOND PARAGRAPH OF 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Regarding the Examiner's assertion that "it is unclear what the components of the recited 'machine' are," Applicants note that claims 23-44 recite a "machine for computing" (emphasis added). Applicants position is that one having ordinary skill in the art would have no difficulty understanding the scope of the phrase "machine for computing," particularly when reasonably interpreted in light of the written description of the specification.<sup>1</sup>

Claim 23 has been amended to clarify that the claimed invention is directed to a machine performing a method.

As to the Examiner's assertion that "the steps" lacks antecedent basis, Applicants respectfully submit that the use of the phrase "the steps comprising" in a preamble of a claim is

---

<sup>1</sup> In re Okuzawa, 537 F.2d 545, 190 USPQ 464 (CCPA 1976); In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).

ubiquitous, and one having ordinary skill in the art would not consider that phrase to be indefinite within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

**CLAIMS 1-44 ARE REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101**

On pages 2-3 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that the claimed invention, as recited in claims 1-44, is directed to non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

On page 2 of the Advisory Action dated November 1, 2005, the Examiner stated that if the claims were amended to "reflect the floating point limitation(s) ... the 101 rejection would be withdrawn." Since independent claims 1 and 23 have been amended in this manner, Applicants respectfully submit that the imposed rejection of claims 1-19 and 23-44 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 has been overcome.

**CLAIM 20 IS REJECTED UNDER THE FIRST PARAGRAPH OF 35 U.S.C. § 112**

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that the claimed invention, as recited in claim 20, is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Although Applicants disagree with the Examiner's conclusion, claim 20 has been cancelled; and thus, the rejection of claim 20 under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 is moot.


Applicants have made every effort to present claims which distinguish over the prior art, and it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance. However, Applicants invite the

Examiner to call the undersigned if it is believed that a telephonic interview would expedite the prosecution of the application to an allowance. Accordingly, and in view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants hereby respectfully request reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 09-0461, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Date: November 7, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Scott D. Paul  
Registration No. 42,984  
Steven M. Greenberg  
Registration No. 44,725  
Christopher & Weisberg, P.A.  
200 E. Las Olas Blvd., Suite 2040  
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301  
Tel: (954) 828-1488  
Facsimile: (954) 828-9122

43223